

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-16, 19-21, 23-24, and 27-29, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US Pat. No. 6,518,962 B2) in view of Johnson et al. (US Pub. 2005/0280766).

Claims 3, 9-10, 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Johnson et al. as applied to claims 1, 19 above, and further in view of Stapleton et al. (US Pat. No. 5,019,807).

Claims 6 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Johnson et al. as applied to claims 5 and 19 above, and further in view of Sokolick et al. (US Pat. No. 6,608,439 B1).

Claims 17 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Johnson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Soules (US Pat. No. 6,423,900 B1).

Claims 18 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Johnson et al., and further in view of Troutman (US Pat. No. 6,157,356).

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended is requested for the following reasons.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 19, the Applicants maintain their argument that Kimura doesn't disclose measuring the voltage of an individual pixel external to the OLED display. Again, Kimura's measurement is of the entire display. Kimura does not measure the voltage of an individual pixel external to the OLED display. Applicants contend that the Examiner agrees with them and has stated in the Office Action of July 11, 2007 that "Kimura et al. does not disclose the additional OLED reference pixel external to the display device and located on a common substrate with the display device having a voltage sensing circuit including a transistor connected to one of the terminals of the OLED pixel for sensing the voltage across the OLED pixel to produce a voltage signal representing the voltage across the OLED pixel." Accordingly, the Examiner chose to cite the reference from Johnson et al. (US Pat. Appl. No. 2005/0280766 A1) in addition to Kimura. However, the Johnson et al. reference is not earlier than Applicants' priority date of May 24, 2000. Therefore, the Johnson et al. reference isn't prior art and is improperly cited. As

such, the Applicants request the final rejection be lifted and that Applicants claims are reconsidered.

Because the properly cited art of Kimura without Johnson et al. does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to skillfully employ applicants' novel technique, Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case, because at least one of Applicants' features is missing in the cited reference of Kimura. Accordingly, Applicants in good faith believe that independent claims 1 and 19 are unobvious in light of the combination Kimura in view of Johnson. The remaining claims are dependent from these claims and are considered to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants have reviewed the cited art made of record, and believe that singly or in any suitable combination, they do not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable. It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the cited art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen H. Shaw", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 45,404

Stephen H. Shaw/set  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-7419  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.